

on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). In “order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgett, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

Neither party objected to the M&R. Therefore, the court reviews for clear error. The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. There is no clear error on the face of the record. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315.

In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 7], DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE Walton’s ADA claims against Carter, and DISMISSES Carter from the case. Walton may proceed with her ADA claims against Relias, LLC.

SO ORDERED. This 16 day of April, 2025.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge